UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United	States of America,	Case No. CR 18-CR-0443 CRB-12
	Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Dan	Boar & Levente) Defendant. mathe)	OCT 3 0 2018
For the under ends o speedy	e reasons stated by the parties on the record the Speedy Trial Act from 6 736 of justice served by the continuance outweight	d on <u>10/30</u> , 2018, the Court excludes time? 2018 to <u>10/20</u> , 2018 and finds that the half the best interest of the public and the defendant in a e Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on
	Failure to grant a continuance would be li See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	kely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
	defendants, the nature of the prosection or law, that it is unreasonable to expect acceptance.	to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact lequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due dil	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, ligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	Failure to grant a continuance would unre counsel's other scheduled case commitmed See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	easonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ents, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
A	Failure to grant a continuance would unrenecessary for effective preparation, taking See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	easonably deny the defendant the reasonable time g into account the exercise of due diligence.
	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATE:	D: 10/30/18	JOSEPH C. SPERO
STIPU	DLATED:	Chief Magistrate Judge
	Attorney for Defendant - Boundary For Deft-May	